As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter

AMERICA

Ed & Helen Dec 4151 Pine Knoll Ave. Kalamazoo, MI 49004

0

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

JUL 1 8 2006

albert stepete-MAILROOM

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

102 whirlaway court, bush, Louisiana 70431-4606

July 12, 2006 11:48 AM

Senator David Vitter U.S. Senate 516 Hart Senate Office Building Washington, DC 20510-0001

Subject: Re: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service CC Docket 96-45

Dear Senator Vitter:

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

albert stengle

CONSULTANCES ARE

CO:

PLRS-ADY OVER TAXED

FCC General Email Box

CO AFTER THE

COLL CompanieS. E

THEY BRAG ABOUT

THEIR PROFITS, LET

THEM BEAR ANY TAXES.

## Richard S. Johns

P.O. Box 189, Mulberry, Florida 33860-0189

JUL 1 8 2006

DOCKET ELLE COPY ONIGINAL

July 09, 2006 04:33 PM

FCC Chairman Kevin J Martin 445 12th St SW Washington, DC. 20554

Subject: Re: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service CC Docket 96-45

Dear Chairman Kevin J Martin:

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose your plan - as Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman, to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

You are proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me - and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users - like big businesses - and placing the weight on low-volume users - students, <u>prepaid wireless users</u>, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers - <u>is unfair</u> - to say the least. I urge you to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

As a law abiding, taxpaying citizen, I do not feel I should have to pay the same amount - seeing as I very rarely use my phone (usually only in cases of trouble or emergency) - as someone who uses their phone 24/7 and has it glued to their heads......

Sincerely,

cc:

Richard Johns

Richard Johns -

FCC General Email Box

Congressman Senators

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

JUL 1 8 2006

Universal Service Fund DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

ur Letter to Washington Decision-Makers

Subject: RE: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service - Docket 96-45

Dear Chairman Martin,

I urge you to support the "Fair Share Plan" as a solution to current concerns with the Universal Service Fund (USF). The Fair Share Plan will keep the USF fair, ensuring that consumers like me do not pay the same rate into the USF as big businesses, regardless of how little I may use long distance.

The Keep USF Fair Coalition submitted the Fair Share Plan to the FCC on January 31, 2005. It expands who pays into the USF so that other technologies—not just phones—pay into the system. The Fair Share Plan collects the USF using a combination numbers- and revenue-based plan. This keeps the system fair, equitable and non-discriminatory.

Under the flat fee or numbers-based plan you are considering, people like me who make few long distance calls would pay the same as people or businesses that make many calls. I believe it would be unfair to charge low-volume and residential customers the same fees as high-volume residential or business customers.

I urge you to keep the USF fair, and adopt the Fair Share Plan. Thank you.

1258 W. Ryan Ave.

Roseville, MN 55113-5930

MEMBERS: Alliance for Public Technology • Alliance for Retired Americans • American Association of People with Disabilities • American Corn Growers Association American Council of the Blind • Black Leadership Forum • Consumer Action • Deafness Research Foundation • Gray Panthers • Latino Issues Forum League of United Latin American Citizens • Maryland Consumer Rights Coalition • National Association of the Deaf • National Grange • National Hispanic Council on Aging National Native American Chamber of Commerce • Telecommunications Research & Action Center • The Seniors Coalition • World Institute on Disability • Supporters NAACP RECEIVED & INSPECTED

JUL 1 8 2006

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Harold Hicks
669 South K Street

FCC - MAILROOM

July 09, 2006 01:03 AM

FCC, Chairman Kevin J Martin 445 12th St SW Washington, DC 20554

Subject: Re: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service CC Docket 96-45

Dear Mr Martin,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose your plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

You are proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge you to rethink this flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing from you on this matter.

Sincerely,

Harold Hieks

cc:

FCC General Email Box

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL US

FCC Chairman Kevin J Martin 445 12th St SW Washington, DC 20554 July 10, 2006

HH :1 0 2000

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

FCC - MAILROOM

Dear Chairman Martin,

I oppose FCC plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

I am paying an arm and a leg for taxes, fees, surcharges on my residential phone bill AND my cell phone bill now; and, to charge a flat fee instead of the way it is charged now is unjust.

A chance in the USF collection from a "pay for what you use" system to a "monthly flat fee" would result in further hiking my phone bills for me and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users like BIG BUSINESSES, and placing the burden on low volume users, like students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low income residential and rural consumers is TOTALLY UNFAIR.

I urge you to rethink the flat fee plan. It is in fact a de-facto tax increase of several million dollars for 43 million of low volume, long distance users in the U.S like myself.

I am retired and living on a low pension. I need both a residential phone and a cell phone for security purposes. I am doing the best I can now with the high cost of gas, heating and other necessities.

Please, do not CHANGE the way the USF charge is made now to increase my phone bills.

Thank you,

Danielle Jenkins / 19 Crabtree Ct Howard OH 43028

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

JUL 1 8 2006

LECC - MAILROOM

DOCKET SHE COPY ORIGINAL

**Robert Eaton** 

4324 Old Colony Road, Raleigh, North Carolina 27613-2026

July 11, 2006 10:19 AM

FCC Chairman Kevin J. Martin 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street SW Washington, DC 20554

Subject: Re: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service CC Docket 96-45

## Dear Chairman Martin:

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) plan to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

You are proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge you to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, fixed income, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please carefully consider my concerns (as well as millions of other fixed income taxpayers) and re-think the USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Robert Eaton

cc:

FCC General Email Box

ListABCOE